

Today's Topics:

airport security (3 msgs)
I want my old callsign back !
New subject: Tesla vs gauss, and ot
Third Party Traffic, MM net and BARF get letters from FCC (2 msgs)
Trend towards requiring SASEs for domestic QSLs? (2 msgs)

Date: 31 Oct 89 14:39:06 GMT

From: asuvax!anasaz!john@handies.ucar.edu (John Moore)

Subject: airport security

In article <1513@ulb.UUCP> cep4478@ulb.UUCP (C.E. Piggott) writes:
]However, a (hypocritical?) note of personal experience is that when
]picking up Dad from New York's LaGuardia airport, I asked the guy
]if he would let me through with my 2m handheld, and he said that
]yes, he would, but he would ask to see my license first. He did

LaGuardia is the only airport in the US that has ever given me any
hassle (other than maybe asking me to demonstrate that the radio
works). They REFUSED to let me take it through security, and said
I had to check it as baggage. Only the intervention of the ticket
agent for my airline (he "vouched" for me even though he had never
seen me before!) get it through. What a bunch of jerks!

--

John Moore (NJ7E) mcdphx!anasaz!john asuvax!anasaz!john
(602) 861-7607 (day or eve) long palladium, short petroleum
7525 Clearwater Pkwy, Scottsdale, AZ 85253

The 2nd amendment is about military weapons, NOT JUST hunting weapons!

Date: 31 Oct 89 20:33:12 GMT

From: mips!wyse!pgraham@apple.com (PC-NFS Philip Graham x1124 #)

Subject: airport security

The only problem I had was not with the HT, but with the charger. I hand carried a
TS-440s, FT-727R (HT), and the associated mics, and HT charger... Of all of
this they only thing they wanted to see was the HT charger. It seems that I had
wrapped the cord around the charger body and it looked sort of "funny" under
X-RAY.... I showed the guard what it was and he waved me thru...

Funny, I was GLAD he checked!!!

DE KJ6NN

Phil

Date: 31 Oct 89 14:40:50 GMT
From: wa3wbu!ka3adu!dave@uunet.uu.net (dave hultberg)
Subject: airport security

So far I haven't had any problems taking either a 2 meter HT or a handheld scanner through airport security. This includes domestic US flights and at least one international trip. I had more trouble getting them to hand check my camera than I had with the radios.

--
-----| UUCP: uunet!wa3wbu!ka3adu!dave |-----
Dave Hultberg KA3UZR
1407 Concord Rd.
Mechanicsburg, Pa. 17055

Date: 31 Oct 89 19:02:11 GMT
From: rochester!rit!ultb!cep4478@louie.udel.edu (C.E. Piggott)
Subject: I want my old callsign back !

>From: root@raider.MFEE.TN.US (Bob Reineri)
...
>Now that I'm getting back into it, I really miss my old call. Is it possible
>to get it back ?
...
>N4CDO (ex WB4QVO :-()

Well, I'm sure I'm not the first to answer "no" to this question, that the FCC does not re-use callsigns in any way once they've expired.

But, with more than half of the callsign districts in the US either out of or NEARLY out of (2-land is up to WU2? from what I hear), it seems pretty obvious to me that this is a stupid policy.

I don't think that amateurs should ever be allowed to pick their own callsigns (e.g. cute acronyms or initials or something), but if I had designed the world (why didn't they ask for my help?) I would allow defunct hams to regain their old callsigns (within a certain amount of time, perhaps), and I *certainly* would reissue defunct callsigns once a group runs out.

Not that I have anything against AA calls, but what happens when THEY run out? A short nifty little callsign would be worth the work at 20wpm,

to me.

Chris N2JGW (tongue-twister callsign on voice modes)

Date: 31 Oct 89 20:23:00 GMT
From: silver!commgrp@iuvax.cs.indiana.edu
Subject: New subject: Tesla vs gauss, and ot

N> ...of course, you mean nanoteslas, since 1954...

There's a word for these guys: 'Correctocrats', i.e., frustrated English majors who got into science/engineering for the money (ha!), and hide their lack of creativity behind academic puritanism.

>>In article <1989Oct29.174631.12960@ux1.cso.uiuc.edu>
mcdonald@aries.scs.uiuc.edu (Doug McDonald) writes:
>>...The Tesla is the correct modern unit; if you look
>>around, you'll see increasing use of it in most fields.
^^^^^^

Please tell me the pun isn't intentional!

>Who ever heard of "de-Tesla-ing" ?

Degaussing is called "delousing" by TV/CB repairmen in Kentucky.
De-Tesla-ing would surely be corrupted to "de-tasseling" in the corn-growing areas of the Midwest.

Back when General Aviation and Major Medical were buck privates, we had resistance, capacity and induction, before some twit decided that it was more "consistent" to have them all end with -ance.
(How does one become empowered to modify the English language?)

I got used to Hertz, but still have trouble with Siemens (same word, singular or plural) which used to be Mhos (or wads? :^)
The Siemens logo appears prominently aboard U-505, the captured Nazi submarine on display at the Museum of Science and Industry in Chicago.

Check the definitions section of the CRC Bible for truly obscure/archaic units of measurement. It's the best reading in the whole book!

I would be p*ssed if they named a unit after me; I'll settle for no less than a universal constant! [Actually, the 'Reid' is a unit of measure used in caving (a.k.a. spelunking): 1000 milliReids is the diameter of the smallest hole my body will fit through.] *(:-)

--

Frank Reid W9MKV NSS 9086F reid@gold.bacs.indiana.edu

Date: 31 Oct 89 17:24:47 GMT
From: mips!wyse!steve@apple.com (Steve Wilson xtemp dept303)
Subject: Third Party Traffic, MM net and BARF get letters from FCC

In article <8910310803.AA27197@ucbvax.Berkeley.EDU> 702WFG@SCRVMSYS.BITNET (bill gunshannon) writes:

>>Date: 28 Oct 89 14:20:13 GMT
>>From: asuvax!anasaz!john@handies.ucar.edu (John Moore)
>> It may be objectionable, but unless it contains business traffic or
>>comes from a country without a third party agreement, it is NOT illegal.
>>There has long been a myth in amateur radio that phone patches (or
>>autopatches) cannot be used to evade tolls. It is just that - a myth.
>>
>

>Let's not be too hasty with this statement either. It may not violate
>Part 97 but that isn't the only law we need be concerned about. I think
>you will find that the use of Amateur Radio to evade tolls could be taken
>into court under the FTC rules concerning "unfair restraint of trade."

First off, I happen to share John's interpretation of the existing rules.
Secondly our service is governed by the FCC not the FTC in the general
case, so I'm not nearly as worried about FTC rules applying to my on-the-air
operation as I am part 97.

In practical terms both the FTC and the FCC have more important fish to
fry than this particular issue. Heck, for that matter its rough enough
to get FCC to pay attention to the real enforcement problems that
hams have that we can't deal with ourselves.

Steve Wilson KA6S

Date: 31 Oct 89 14:41:26 GMT
From: asuvax!anasaz!john@handies.ucar.edu (John Moore)
Subject: Third Party Traffic, MM net and BARF get letters from FCC

In article <8910310803.AA27197@ucbvax.Berkeley.EDU> 702WFG@SCRVMSYS.BITNET (bill gunshannon) writes:

]>Date: 28 Oct 89 14:20:13 GMT
]>From: asuvax!anasaz!john@handies.ucar.edu (John Moore)
]>Subject: Third Party Traffic, MM net and BARF get letters from FCC

]>
]>In article <968@lopez.UUCP> flash@lopez.UUCP (Gary Bourgois) writes:
]>|to. In addition to emergency traffic, friendly greetings etc are not any
]>|threat to any commercial carrier. It is when amateurs blatantly solicit
]>|phone patch traffic that the activity becomes objectionable. I do not
]>
]> It may be objectionable, but unless it contains business traffic or
]>comes from a country without a third party agreement, it is NOT illegal.
]>There has long been a myth in amateur radio that phone patches (or
]>autopatches) cannot be used to evade tolls. It is just that - a myth.
]>
]
]Let's not be too hasty with this statement either. It may not violate
]Part 97 but that isn't the only law we need be concerned about. I think
]you will find that the use of Amateur Radio to evade tolls could be taken
]into court under the FTC rules concerning "unfair restraint of trade."

You've got to be kidding! Restraint of trade? Please quote chapter
and verse.

--

John Moore (NJ7E) mcdphx!anasaz!john asuvax!anasaz!john
(602) 861-7607 (day or eve) long palladium, short petroleum
7525 Clearwater Pkwy, Scottsdale, AZ 85253
The 2nd amendment is about military weapons, NOT JUST hunting weapons!

Date: 31 Oct 89 22:42:37 GMT
From: brian@ucsd.edu (Brian Kantor)
Subject: Trend towards requiring SASEs for domestic QSLs?

When I first got my ham license (nearly 20 years ago), I bought 100 QSL
cards from the Little Print Shop. About half of those were sent away
in response to 6-meter FM DX contacts, and about half of them were lost
when the dishwasher faulted all over my basement workbench. I have one
left that I use to get into the ham swapmeets.

It isn't the postage that deters me from sending cards, it's the cards
themselves. I have no desire to receive them so I don't send them.
Never saw much use in it any way - I know I made the contact, and I'm
not applying for certificates, so why acquire proof?

I suspect that if someone wanted my QSL badly enough to send me an SASE,
I'd jot the requisite information on some computer graphics postcard (or
a condom wrapper or something) and send it to him. After all, if he
wants it that bad, I'll cooperate.

Many other UHFers I know feel just the same. It's the achievement that's

the REAL reward, not the wallpaper.
- Brian

Date: 31 Oct 89 20:29:42 GMT
From: mips!wyse!pgraham@apple.com (PC-NFS Philip Graham x1124 #)
Subject: Trend towards requiring SASEs for domestic QSLs?

I have also noticed that many US hams are not responding to QSL cards sent by other hams in the US... I can understand the poor guy from a small state (in terms of ham population) getting overloaded, but I have had trouble from hams in states like Texas and Ohio... I guess the fact that I am in California is my own problem (too many hams here, HI HI), and everyone has a card(s) from this state.

I have sent some cards in the US with an SASE and this gets +MORE+ cards back, I even had one good ham, who sent back my SASE, with a his QSL card, in his envelope and explained what a sad state we must be in for US hams to have to SASE, when they spend thousands of dollars on equipment but will not spend 15 cents on a few QSL cards.

I suggest that if you do not want to QSL tell the person on the other side in the QS0, explain that it is too much trouble. The other thing that we can also do is to ask if a QSL is OK. Some people do not have the extra cash to respond to "alot" (whatever that is) of QSL cards...

Just my 2 cents worth...
DE KJ6NN
Phil

End of INFO-HAMS Digest V89 Issue #830
